

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/784,421	02/23/2004	Paul D. Verhagen	13222.01/YOD ITWO:00201	2564		
7.	590 09/07/2005		EXAM	INER		
Patrick S. You	Patrick S. Yoder			LEUNG, PHILIP H		
FLETCHER Y	ODER					
P.O. Box 692289			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
Houston, TX 77269-2289			3742			

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

0	1
ð	0

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/784,421	VERHAGEN, PAUL D.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Philip H. Leung	3742	

before the riling of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Philip H. Leung	3742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
HE REPLY FILED 19 August 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).						
AMENDMENTS						
The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause			
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO	IE below);				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beautiful appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
 The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 		mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a		Alasah Chadaaa aa aa aa	-4 C 11			
non-allowable claim(s).	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	nt canceling the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro	\square will not be entered, or b) \boxtimes will will will be will be with the will be	Il be entered and an e	xplanation of			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>11-15</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4 and 20-23</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	t bafara as as the data of filling - No	- 4:	A 1			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	rit or other evidence is	t be entered s necessary and			
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)				
13.		Philip H Leung Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3742	S .			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In regard to claim 1, the control circuit 10 of Pacileo meets the limitation "operable to control tha application of power from a power source to an induction heating cable" as the claim does not require AC or DC power. The power supply 22 clearly include rectifier or inverter for DC or AC operation, one of ordinary skill can determine the use of either DC or AC depending on the heating requirement. In regard to claim 20, Ohmori clearly includes an inductor with temperature sensor and the use of grounding capacitor with a temperature sensor for reducing noises is well known in the art as shown in Gipp and Muller. Only the argument regarding to claims 11-15 is persuasive.